

Emergent Geometric Hamiltonian and Insulator-Superfluid Phase Transitions

Fei Zhou

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia,
6224 Agricultural Road, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, V6T 1Z1*

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

I argue that certain bosonic insulator-superfluid phase transitions as an interaction constant varies are driven by emergent geometric properties of insulating states. The *renormalized* chemical potential and population of disordered bosons at different levels define the geometric aspect of an effective low energy Hamiltonian which I employ to study various resonating states and quantum phase transitions. In a mean field approximation, I also demonstrate that the quantum phase transitions are in the universality class of a percolation problem.

PACS number: 03.75.Kk, 03.75.Lm, 03.70.+K

Localization or delocalization of interacting bosons has been a puzzling theoretical and experimental issue for quite long time^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9}. Anderson *et al.* first investigated a possibility of Bose condensation into an extended eigenstate in disordered systems and pointed out certain instabilities of such condensates¹. Giamarchi and Schulz employed the replica-trick-based renormalization equations to study the quantum phase transitions between superfluid states and insulating states in one dimension⁴. Fisher *et al.* on the other hand investigated the localization of interacting bosons in the context of a Bose-Hubbard (lattice) model⁶. In high-dimensions, this different approach appears to be very fruitful resulting in various new observations; for instance a new distinct Bose-glass phase has been emphasized and its divergent superfluid susceptibility was pointed out. In the same context, numerical results further suggested additional Anderson-type insulating states in weak couplings⁷. More recently, 1d superfluid-Mott-glass phase transitions in a particle-hole symmetric lattice model have been studied⁹. Finally, a system of cold atoms in a random laser speckle potential has also been established and studied¹⁰.

However, little attention has been so far paid to the *microscopics* of bosonic insulators in the dilute limit. Technically, the complexity of this issue is largely related to the failure of the replica-technique-based perturbative approach applied in this limit (in both 1D and high dimensions). This aspect of the problem seems likely to originate from a very high degree of inhomogeneity of bosonic insulators which is hard for a standard perturbative replica-trick-based approach (either mean field or one-loop expansion) to capture. When all low energy one-particle states are localized, the instability of a conventional ideal boson condensate (with a given number density in an infinity system) towards a local condensate with infinite number density appears to be evident. It is the finite repulsive interaction which prevents such collapsing from taking place. This distinctly differs from the problem of fermion localization: various fixed points in the one-parameter scaling theory for noninteracting system seem to be stable in weakly interacting systems¹¹.

In this Letter, I would like to study the renormalized chemical potential and population of bosons at differ-

ent localized states to illustrate the microscopic structure of bosonic insulators. Secondly, I will argue that interactions between bosons result in an emergent geometry of bosonic insulators. This observation suggests that certain superfluid-insulator quantum phase transitions should be predominantly driven by geometrically percolating localized states. I also apply the mean field solutions to probe the low energy Hilbert subspace relevant to quantum critical points. At last I propose to study critical behaviors of these quantum phase transitions using an effective Hamiltonian defined in percolating clusters.

Consider bosons in a d-dimension space with simple short range random impurity potentials. All relevant low energy one-particle states are already localized (and are far away from the mobility edge which separates extended one-particle states and localized states). Furthermore, bosons interact via a weak two-body delta-like interaction $U_0\delta(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')$. The set of wave functions I am going to exam can be written in the following form

$$\Psi \sim \sum_{\{n_k\}} g(\{n_k\}) \prod_k \frac{(b_k^\dagger e^{i\phi_k})^{n_k}}{\sqrt{n_k!}} |vac>; \quad (1)$$

$b_k^\dagger$ is the creation operator of a boson at a localized one-particle state k of energy ϵ_k and ϕ_k is the corresponding phase. Different states correspond to different choices of $g(\{n_k\})$. For an insulator in the *weakly* interacting limit (i.e. the dimensionless interaction constant Γ is small), $g(\{n_k\})$ is nonzero only for a given set of integer values of $n_k = \text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)]$ and no resonance is involved. $n(\epsilon)$ as a function of ϵ is calculated below and depends on both interactions and disorder strength. Here $\text{Int}[I + \eta]$ takes integer value I if $1/2 > \eta > 0$ and $I + 1$ if $1 > \eta > 1/2$; at $\eta = 1/2$ it is equal to either I or $I + 1/2$. For a superfluid phase, g is a smooth function within a wide range of distribution $\{n_k\}$; an extreme case is the equal-amplitude state with $g(\{n_k\})$ being constant.

Consider an insulator in the weakly interacting limit where the spatial overlap between different occupied states is negligible; $g(\{n_k\}) = \prod_k \delta_{n_k, \text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)]}$. The total (mean field) energy for such a state which is fully characterized by $\{n(\epsilon_k)\}$ and is independent of $\{\phi_k\}$ (see Eq.(1)

and discussions following it) can be shown to be

$$\begin{aligned} E_0(\{n(\epsilon_k)\}, \{\phi_k\}) &= \int d\epsilon(\epsilon - \mu)\nu(\epsilon)n(\epsilon) \\ &+ U_0 \int d\epsilon d\epsilon' n(\epsilon)n(\epsilon')C(\epsilon, \epsilon'), \\ C(\epsilon, \epsilon') &= \int d^d\mathbf{r}\nu(\epsilon, \mathbf{r})\nu(\epsilon', \mathbf{r}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

μ is the chemical potential to be determined self-consistently. $\nu(\epsilon)$ and $\nu(\epsilon, \mathbf{r})$ are the density of states and local density of states respectively, $\nu(\epsilon, \mathbf{r}) = \sum_k \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_k)\psi_k^*(\mathbf{r})\psi_k(\mathbf{r})$, $\nu(\epsilon) = \int d^d\mathbf{r}\nu(\epsilon, \mathbf{r})$. k is a quantum number labeling one-particle eigenstates in the disordered system. Finally, the distribution is subject to a constraint that the average number density is ρ_0 , i.e., $\int d\epsilon n(\epsilon)\nu(\epsilon) = V_0\rho_0$. (V_0 is the Volume.) Minimizing $E_0(\{n(\epsilon_k)\})$ with respect to $\{n(\epsilon_k)\}$ suggests the following integral equation for the ground state population distribution ($\epsilon < \mu$)

$$2U_0 \int d\epsilon' n(\epsilon')C(\epsilon, \epsilon') = \nu(\epsilon)(\mu - \epsilon). \quad (3)$$

I practically seek for a solution when interactions are weak and the chemical potential μ is much smaller than $\Delta_0 = (\nu(\mu)\xi_L^d)^{-1}$, the *typical* single particle level spacing at chemical potential in a volume defined by the localization length ξ_L (And for simplicity, we neglect the energy dependence of ξ_L for all states under consideration are far away from the mobility edge.). In the leading order of μ/Δ_0 , I obtain the solution to Eq.(3) (after an average over random potentials) in d-dimension¹⁴

$$n(\epsilon) = \frac{N_L}{2\Gamma} \frac{\mu - \epsilon}{\epsilon_F}, \quad \frac{\mu}{\epsilon_F} = \left(\frac{\Gamma}{N_L}\right)^{2/(d+2)} S \quad (4)$$

when $\epsilon \leq \mu$; otherwise, $n(\epsilon > \mu) = 0$. Two dimensionless parameters entering the solution are

$$N_L = \xi_L^d \rho_0, \quad \Gamma = \frac{U_0 \rho_0}{\epsilon_F} \quad (5)$$

which characterize the strength of disorder and interactions respectively. $\epsilon_F = \rho_0^{2/d}/2m$ is the Fermi energy for free fermions with the identical mass (m) and density (ρ_0); S is a constant of order of unity (I have set $\hbar = 1$). I also assume that N_L is much larger than one. It is worth remarking that μ , the *renormalized* chemical potential of disordered bosons is proportional to $\rho_0^{2/(d+2)}$.

The microscopic properties of the insulating states are fully characterized by this distribution function. For instance, one can evaluate ξ_T , the typical distance between two states occupied by weakly interacting bosons, the typical number density of bosons in each occupied state ρ_L and the ratio between Δ_0 and μ . I list the results here

$$\frac{\Delta_0}{\mu} \sim \frac{\rho_L}{\rho_0} = \left(\frac{\xi_T}{\xi_L}\right)^d = \frac{1}{N_L} \left(\frac{N_L}{\Gamma}\right)^{d/(d+2)} \quad (6)$$

which have been expressed in terms of N_L and Γ . Following Eq.(6) that in a dilute limit where ξ_T is much larger than ξ_L , or $\Gamma \ll N_L^{-2/d} (\ll 1)$, the local level spacing Δ_0 is much larger than μ .

If the interaction is indeed very weak so that $\xi_T \gg \xi_L$, then typical finite-size condensates at various localized states with the density ρ_L are spatially disconnected. For a typical localized state k , the number of particles in the ground state is unique except when $n(\epsilon_k)$ is a half-integer. The energy gap in local particle-like or hole-like excitation spectra can be shown to be proportional to $\{1 \pm 2\text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)] \mp 2n(\epsilon_k)\} \Gamma\mu_F/N_L$ and distribute in a range between 0 to $a_0\Gamma\mu_F/N_L$ (a_0 is a quantity of order of unity). One therefore obtains the typical on-site temporal correlation function $G^T(\tau, 0) = \langle b^+(\tau, \mathbf{r})b(0, \mathbf{r}) \rangle$,

$$G^T(\tau, 0) = \exp(-\frac{\tau}{\tau_c}), \quad \tau_c \sim \frac{N_L}{\Gamma\epsilon_F} \quad (7)$$

which reflects the well-known $U(1)$ -symmetry restoring occurring *independently* at different localized states. (the superscript T indicates a typical value). For the non-interacting case, τ_c goes to infinity as it should for ideal bosons.

When $n(\epsilon_k)$ is precisely a half integer, however lowest energy states are two-fold degenerate. These states play an important role in the calculation of the averaged Green's function and can yield to an ensemble averaged power-law temporal correlation and divergent susceptibility.

Eq.(4) indicates that locally, *many-body* collective states with $\text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)]$ $\text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)] \pm 1$, $\text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)] \pm 2$, ... bosons form a low energy Hilbert subspace. To establish a phase coherence and superfluidity, a local condensate k with $n_k = \text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)]$ bosons has to *resonate* with low lying states of $n_k \pm 1$, $n_k \pm 2$, ... bosons. For studies of the physics close to insulator-Superfluid quantum phase transitions, one has to therefore take into account all the low energy states represented by $n_k = \text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)]$, $\text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)] \pm 1$, $\text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)] \pm 2$ etc. A convenient basis to discuss resonance between these states is the following coherent state representation

$$\begin{aligned} |\{\phi_k\}\rangle &\approx \prod_k \sum_{n_k} g_0(n_k - \text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)]) \frac{(b_k^\dagger e^{i\phi_k})^{n_k}}{\sqrt{n_k!}} |vac\rangle, \\ \langle \{\phi_k\} | \{\phi'_k\} \rangle &\approx \prod_k \delta(\phi_k - \phi'_k). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$g_0(n)$ is unity for $n_{max} > |n| > 0$; n_{max} is much larger than one but smaller than $n(\epsilon_k)$ so that *all the low energy states to be involved in resonance are present* in this representation.

The energy of these states, in addition to that in Eq.(3) acquires contributions from the the exchange (random) coupling between two resonating condensates. This consideration and Eqs.(3), (7) indicate that close to insulator-superfluid transitions, the effective Hamiltonian in the *truncated low energy subspace* spanned by states in Eq.(8) should be¹⁴

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{eff} &= \sum_{all k} E_c(k) (\hat{n}_k - n(\epsilon_k))^2 \\ &+ \sum_C \sum_{<kl> \in C} J_{kl} \cos(\phi_k - \phi_l); \\ E_c &= \frac{B_k}{\tau_c}, J_{kl} = \frac{(n(\epsilon_k)n(\epsilon_l))^{1/2}}{\rho_L \xi_L^d} A_{kl} J. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here $\hat{n}_k = b_k^\dagger b_k$ is the number operator of bosons at state k ; and $[\hat{n}_k, \phi_l] = -i\delta_{k,k'}$. The magnitude of $n(\epsilon_k)$ is given in Eq.(4). The amplitude of J_{kl} is given by $J = \rho_L \xi_L^d \mu$; $B_k \sim \xi_L^d \int d\mathbf{r} |\psi_k^*(\mathbf{r}) \psi_k(\mathbf{r})|^2$, and the overlap integral between two localized states is $A_{kl} \sim \int \psi_k^*(\mathbf{r}) \psi_l(\mathbf{r}) \rho(\mathbf{r}) / \rho_L d\mathbf{r}$; $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is the local boson density. Finally, in deriving Eq.(9) I have neglected a) exchange interactions between pairs of states of distance much longer than ξ_L because A_{kl} , the overlap integrals of those pairs are exponentially small; b) exchange couplings involving four contacting localized condensates. Only exchange couplings between two contacting localized states separated by distance smaller than ξ_L (labeled as $<kl>$ in the second sum) are kept. Configurations of contacting localized states define clusters $\{C\}$ of various sizes and represent *resonating* localized condensates. Note that for a given Γ , properties of an insulating state are determined by the Hamiltonian in Eq.(9) defined in percolating clusters $\{C\}$ of resonating states; the distribution of clusters $\{C\}$ itself is a function of Γ as an emergent property of insulating states.

The ratio between the above two energies, $1/\tau_c$ and J is

$$\frac{1}{J\tau_c} = a \left(\frac{\Gamma}{N_L} \right)^{2d/(d+2)}, \quad (10)$$

which is much less than unity when $\Gamma \ll N_L$. (a and b introduced below are constants of order of unity.) Close to the percolation threshold discussed below, $1/J\tau_c$ is proportional to $1/N_L^2$ and turns out to be much smaller than unity as N_L in our case is much less than one.

In a *mean field approximation* where $1/J\tau_c$ is set to be zero, phases of two localized condensates are locked once they are in contact. $G_C^T(\tau, 0)$, the typical temporal Green's function of bosons belonging to a given cluster C (with random chemical potentials of course), is a function of the size s of the cluster C only. For a given cluster, this Green's function is still given by Eq.(7); however, τ_c is replaced with $s\tau_c$ implying the slow down of the quantum symmetry restoring in large clusters.

Solutions to Eq.(9) can be obtained in this mean field approximation ($d > 2$ for the rest of discussions). When all clusters $\{C_\infty\}$ present are infinite, the following wave function of a *resonating* state with various clusters represents one of such solutions¹⁴,

$$\begin{aligned} |g\rangle &\approx \prod_{C_\infty} \prod_{k \in C_\infty} \sum_{n_k} g_0(n_k - \text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)]) \frac{(b_k^\dagger e^{i\phi_k})^{n_k}}{\sqrt{n_k!}} \\ &\prod_{l \neq k} \sum_{\{n_l\}} \delta_{n_l, \text{Int}[n(\epsilon_l)]} \prod_l \frac{(b_l^\dagger)^{n_l}}{\sqrt{n_l!}} |vac\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the second term corresponds to the wave function of localized bosons that do not belong to any clusters C_∞ . The set of variables $\{\phi_k, k \in C_\infty\}$ minimize the exchange couplings in Eq.(9). Again $g_0(n_k - \text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)])$ is a smooth function in the vicinity of $n_k = \text{Int}[n(\epsilon_k)]$ which stands for resonance between localized condensates with different occupation numbers.

Close to the percolation threshold, one obtains the following formula of the Green's function

$$G^T(\tau, 0) = \sum_s P(s) \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{s\tau_c}\right); \quad (12)$$

$P(s)$ is the probability of finding a localized state belonging to a cluster of size s and exhibits interesting scaling behaviors (for general discussions, see Ref.12, 13). Let us define that the concentration of occupied states as $p(\Gamma, N_L) = b(\xi_L/\xi_T)^d = bN_L(\Gamma/N_L)^{d/(d+2)}$. The one-parameter scaling ansatz suggests that $P(s) \sim P_0(s/\xi(p))$. Thus, one arrives at the following scaling form $G^T(\tau, 0) \sim g_t(\tau/\tau_c \xi(p))$; $g_t(x)$ approaches zero when x goes to infinity. Here $\xi(p)$ is the percolation correlation length expected to diverge as $|p - p_c|^{-\nu}$; close to the critical interacting constant Γ_c^L , one generally has $\xi(\Gamma, N_L) \sim (\Gamma_c^L - \Gamma)^{-\nu}$.

Eq.(12) and discussions above therefore indicate that $U(1)$ -symmetry breaking should take place if and only if the percolating threshold is reached so that $\xi(p)$ is infinite. The appearance of infinitely percolating clusters (with a finite density) turns out to be necessary and sufficient (in a mean field approximation) for the development of long range correlations. An estimate based on Eq.(6) yields the critical point for geometric quantum phase transitions

$$\Gamma_c^L = \left(\frac{p_c}{b}\right)^{-d/(d+2)} N_L^{-2/d}. \quad (13)$$

The superscript L stands for a lower critical point for the superfluid phase. As d approaches infinity, the percolation threshold p_c scales as $1/d$ and clusters of infinite size first appear in the dilute limit where $\xi_T \gg \xi_L$. The percolation can be studied in a mean field approximation¹⁵.

Furthermore, the superfluid density above the percolation threshold p_c can also be related to clusters extending to infinity. One can easily establish that ρ_s^U ,

the upper bound of the superfluid density ρ_s should be proportional to $n_\infty(\Gamma)$, the probability density for a local state to be in an infinite cluster appearing above Γ_c^L . $\rho_s^U = \rho_0 n_\infty(\Gamma) \sim (\Gamma - \Gamma_c^L)^\beta$. In the mean field approximation, the critical exponents are $\nu = 1/2$, $\beta = 1$.

The above mean field approximation appears to be oversimplified from the point of view of Shklovskii-De Gennes backbone (SDeGb) model for percolating clusters^{16,17}. In fact, the SDeGb model indicates that percolating clusters consist of dense regions connected by one-dimensional strands even when $d > 1$. Early results further imply that it should be unlikely for a 1D infinite quantum system to be ordered¹⁸. So at any small but finite value of $1/J\tau_c$, we expect, after taking into account quantum effects, that the onset superfluidity appears above the percolation threshold. Particularly, the true quantum transition takes place when bosons along 1D strands (with finite length) in the SDeGb model become correlated in phases. Thus, the lower critical value Γ_{cQ}^L receives a quantum correction,

$$\frac{\Gamma_{cQ}^L - \Gamma_c^L}{\Gamma_c^L} \sim \left(\frac{\xi_L}{\xi_{1d}(1/J\tau_c)} \right)^{1/\gamma}. \quad (14)$$

Here $\xi_{1d}(\alpha)$ is the correlation length of bosons along 1D strands in a Shklovskii-de Gennes cluster and is expected to be exponentially long compared to ξ_L when α approaches zero. γ is the critical exponent of percolation correlation length above the threshold. As indicated in Eq.(14), the quantum correction to the lower critical point $\Gamma_{cQ}^L - \Gamma_c^L$ is negligible when $1/J\tau_c$ is much smaller than unity. Though in this case the critical phenomenon might differ from the percolative ones, the size of the

critical regime where the deviation from the mean field critical behavior becomes evident could be *exponentially* small as Eq.(14) which sets this size implies.

At last let us consider what happens when interactions are further increased and $\Gamma \gg N_L$. Bosons at different localized states then prefer to have independent dynamics; that is, $G_c^T(\tau, 0; 0, 0) \sim \exp(-\tau/\tau_c)$ and therefore $G^T(\tau, 0)$ discussed in Eq.(12) remains short ranged even when there are infinite clusters¹⁹. The above argument suggests that the upper critical point for the superfluid phase should be set by the following equation: $\Gamma_c^U = cN_L$ and c is a number of order of unity. The superfluid phase appears when $\Gamma_c^U > \Gamma > \Gamma_c^L$.

When N_L is much less than one as in the presence of strong disorder, $\Gamma_c^U \ll \Gamma_c^L$ and the regime where the superfluid phase exists shrinks to zero. Indeed, bosons in each localized state have independent dynamics, either because of the absence of connected clusters ($\Gamma \ll \Gamma_c^L$) or when above the percolation threshold, because of the rapid quantum symmetry restoring ($\Gamma > \Gamma_c^L \gg \Gamma_c^U$). No insulator-superfluid phase transitions are likely to occur in this case and there is one single insulating phase¹⁹.

To summarize, I show that bosonic insulators of interacting bosons have fascinating geometric properties which are characterized by the parameters in Eq.(6). Certain quantum phase transitions from insulators to superfluid phases as the interaction constant varies are strongly influenced by the emergent geometries of insulating states. This work is in part supported by NSERC, Canada and a grant from UBC. I would like to thank P. W. Anderson, B. Bergersen, G. Refael, S. Sachdev, B. Spivak and P. B. Wiegmann for helpful discussions.

-
- ¹ P. W. Anderson, Mater. Res. Bull. **5**, 549 (1970); J. A. Hertz, L. Fleishman, and P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 942 (1979).
 - ² J. D. Reppy, Physica **126B**, 335 (1984); J. Low Temp. Phys. **87**, 205 (1992).
 - ³ M. Ma, B. I. Halperin, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. **B34**, 3136 (1986).
 - ⁴ T. Giamarchi and H. J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. **B37**, 325 (1988).
 - ⁵ D. Finotello, K. A. Gillis, A. Wong, and M. H. W. Chan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1954 (1988).
 - ⁶ M. P. Fisher, P.B. Weichman, G. Grinstein and D. Fisher, Phys. Rev. **B40**, 546 (1989).
 - ⁷ R. T. Scalettar, G. G. Batrouni, and G. Zimanyi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 3144 (1991).
 - ⁸ W. Krauth, N. Trivedi, and D. Ceperley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2307 (1991).
 - ⁹ E. Altman, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and G. Refael, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 150402 (2004).
 - ¹⁰ J. E. Lye, L. Fallani, M. Modugno, D. Wiersma, C. Fort and M. Inguscio, cond-mat/0412167. See also R. Roth and K. Burnett, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 023604 (2003); B. Damski, J. Zakrzewski, L. Santos, P. Zoller, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 080403 (2003).
 - ¹¹ P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1492 (1958); D. J. Thouless, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39**, 1167 (1977); E. Abrahams, P. W. Anderson, D. C. Licciardello, and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 673 (1979); L. P. Gorkov, A. I. Larkin and D. E. Khmel'nitsky, JETP Lett. **30**, 228 (1979); See also P. A. Lee and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**, 287 (1985).
 - ¹² M. Plischke and B. Bergersen, *Equilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (World Scientific, 1994).
 - ¹³ P. M. Chaikin and T. C. Lubensky, *Principles of condensed matter physics*, (Cambridge Press, 2000).
 - ¹⁴ F. Zhou, unpublished (2005).
 - ¹⁵ The effect of level repulsion on percolation can be taken into account by redefining the concentration p .
 - ¹⁶ A. S. Skal and B. I. Shklovskii, Sov. Phys. Semicond. **8**, 1029 (1975).
 - ¹⁷ P. G. De Gennes, J. Phys. Paris. Lett. **37**, L1 (1976).
 - ¹⁸ J. W. Hartman and P. B. Weichman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4584 (1995).
 - ¹⁹ The impurity potentials considered in this article are unbounded; for bounded potentials as those introduced and studied in Ref.6,7,8, there can be more than one insulating

phases.

²⁰ For cold atoms, the dimensionless coupling constant Γ can be experimentally varied either by varying the two-body

scattering length close to the Feshbach resonance or simply varying the density ρ_0 .